

EXHIBIT NO. 2—CERTIFICATION AND REGULATION FEES INTERNATIONAL COMPARISONS

User Fee	Australia	United Kingdom ¹	Canada ²	Japan	United States
Air Operators Certificate	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No.
Pilot License	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	1997.
Licensing for Airmen Other Than Pilots	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	1997.
Airmen Medical Certification	Yes	Yes	Yes	No.
Other Designees (airworthiness representatives, manufacturing inspection representatives)	Yes	No	No.
Certificate of Airworthiness	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No.
Certificate of Airworthiness Renewal	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No.
Noise Type	Yes	No	Yes	No.
Noise Type Renewal	No	Yes	No.
Type Certificate	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No.
Aircraft Registration	Yes	Yes	Yes.
Simulator Certificate (Annual and Renewal)	Yes	No	No.

¹ Other fees charged include: aircraft engine emissions; air traffic controllers' license (Canada also charges this fee); flying exhibit fees where more than 500 people are likely to attend.

² Generally these charges do not reflect costs of providing service. About 70–80% of Canada's regulatory function is subsidized by general taxpayers, and 20–30% is funded by user fees.

Note: Australian fees in effect on 7/90. Civil Aviation Authority (United Kingdom) fees in effect on 4/95 (rates are updated annually). Canadian fees effective as of 8/95. Japan's user fees in effect on 10/95.

As shown in the very first chart, the total projected revenue from certification, regulation, and licensing user fees is \$345.1 million. This compares with the allocated cost¹ for Aviation Regulation & Certification of \$658.6 million, resulting in a shortfall of \$313.5 million. (See Appendix No. 2, "Comparison of Costs and Revenues by Activity.") While the precise amount of the deficit can be adjusted, e.g., adjust aircraft registration fee, reexamine aircraft certification revenue projection, or institute additional fees, the bottom line is that there is a sizable deficit between revenue from user fees and the costs of providing certification and regulation services.

CONGRESS MUST ACT CAREFULLY WHEN REGULATING SECOND AMENDMENT RIGHTS

HON. STEVE GUNDERSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 26, 1996

Mr. GUNDERSON. Mr. Speaker, the debate about guns is as old as these United States of America. The American Revolution was about tyranny of the few over the many; and the power to control the masses included the ability to control firearms. As a result, our Founding Fathers believed it essential to guarantee the right to bear arms as a way to prevent history from repeating itself.

Throughout the ensuing 220 years, the second amendment has served us well—for food, for defense, and for sport. Guns were necessary to secure food and for protection as families settled our country during the early years of the country. Gun skills were vital to life then, remained important through two World Wars, and are still important today, especially to those outdoors enthusiasts in Wisconsin. There are many gun clubs in western Wisconsin, where young and old alike practice against targets and clay pigeons. Our hunters enjoy the sport and challenge of trying to bag a buck or a bird. We must ensure that their enjoyment can continue.

Yet everyone should recognize that the second amendment right to bear arms is not absolute. Congress has the ability to regulate the use of firearms where necessary. For example, over 60 years ago, Congress prohibited automatic weapons—machine guns—because allowing the sale of these weapons was contrary to the public interest. Today, we need to confront another growing problem—incidences of random gun violence by individuals and excessive drug-induced violence. This violence often pits our law enforcement personnel against criminals with greater firepower.

I believe that some firearms can be regulated by Congress without violating our second amendment rights. Just as a person cannot abuse his free speech rights by yelling fire in a crowded theater, there are reasonable limits that Congress may need to place on certain firearms. The issues are what firearms Congress regulates and how the regulation is conducted.

Today, we confront that issue as the House of Representatives again considers the assault weapons ban. Once again, both supporters and opponents have made their views known with emotional fervor. Both sides approach this debate with important and valid concerns. To many, the issue is the basic guaranty to bear arms provided in the second amendment to the Constitution. To others, the issue is a question of how to protect against mass killings all over the country, in both urban and rural areas.

When the House considered the assault ban in 1994, I noted that the real issue was not whether Congress could ban a short, designated list of firearms. Rather, the issue was whether, in addition to a short list, the people wanted to entrust the Federal bureaucracy with the power to decide which firearms were copies or duplicates of the firearms banned in the law or that met the additional banned firearm criteria. Supporters claimed that language prohibiting copies or duplicates is necessary to be effective and that the additional banned modifications are narrowly tailored. Opponents disagreed, noting that the effect would likely be to ban dozens of weapons. By a narrow vote of 216 to 214, the House decided that the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms [BATF] should have that power.

In my opinion, the existing assault weapons law leaves excessive discretion to the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms to determine when modified firearms should be banned. I believe then, as I believe now, that providing such wide latitude is wrong and that Congress must be more specific if it is to act at all.

As a result, I will vote to repeal the assault weapons ban. I sincerely believe that Congress must act very carefully when curtailing constitutionally protected rights, and it must fully disclose the effects of the legislation it passes to regulate those rights. The House did neither when it passed the assault weapons ban in 1994.

H.R. 2202, IMMIGRATION REFORM

HON. MAXINE WATERS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 26, 1996

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to be present for the floor debate on immigration reform due to business in my district. However, I would like to submit my views on H.R. 2202 for the RECORD.

As a Californian, I am well aware of many of the problems and economic strains associated with illegal immigration. However, we must not deter people, many who come here seeking freedom and opportunity, and many who have become productive citizens, from legally entering the United States. Many legal immigrants come to this country with a desire to work. Our challenge is to manage that flow rationally.

H.R. 2202 is an extreme measure that not only attempts to stop illegals from crossing our borders—often in unworkable and repressive ways—but also limits many of our family members such as sisters, brothers, parents, and adult children from joining us in America. This bill actually punishes legal residents and citizens by unreasonably restricting family reunification visas. It denies adult children and siblings of citizens and legal residents—many who have waited years to enter the United States—the chance to reunite with their families in America. This change in law would unfairly punish families that depend on their loved ones, not the Government, for support.

This bill also imposes annual refugee caps, limiting the number of eligible refugee applications to 50,000 per year—that's almost half of the current number. These people may be terrorized by their government, and have no other recourse than to flee their nation. Under this legislation, refugees could be turned away if the immigration quota of 50,000 for that year has been filled. This is a disgrace for a nation with a solid tradition of immigration, and a history of being a refuge for those who flee terror and deprivation.

I am disillusioned that some of my colleagues seek to make this bad bill worse by amending it to deny children an education, simply because they happen to be born to undocumented parents. Such a move would only further hurt an already disadvantaged child. It is absolutely cruel to punish innocent children for their parents' decisions.

This provision would also take a financial toll. In Los Angeles County alone—my home, and the home to nearly 30 percent of California's public school population of almost 1.5 million—the administrative costs for verification

could total as much as \$97 million over a 7-year period, at \$37 per student plus startup costs. It makes more sense to educate our children, rather than waste our resources verifying their citizenship, while risking discriminating against our own citizens in the process.

Other provisions, such as those which would force public hospitals to identify illegals before being reimbursed, are equally immoral. This could threaten public health and possibly increase harassment and discrimination in our hospitals.

It is my hope that we may vote to divide this bill into two parts, one which deals with legal immigration and the other with illegal immigration. I support securing our borders with more agents, better equipment, and sturdy barriers. I applaud the deportation of criminals and increased penalties for people who fraudulently reproduce U.S. documents. However, I do not back the provision to enhance the power of Federal law enforcement, including increasing wiretap authority. This is a complex bill with more weaknesses than strengths, at this point. Splitting the bill could allow us to focus on the real problem, which is stopping illegal, not legal, immigration.

Let us decrease the flow of illegal immigrants to our Nation, while proceeding to advance legal immigration. Our country continues to obtain its ultimate strength from diversity. Our tradition as a nation of immigrants obligates us to find a fair and just way to handle that responsibility.

Specifically, on the amendments, had I been present, I would have voted as follows:

Amendment No. 3, offered by Representative BEILENSEN—"yes";

Amendment No. 4, offered by Representative MCCOLLUM—"yes";

Amendment No. 7, offered by Representative BRYANT (TN)—"no";

Amendment No. 9, offered by Representative VELÁZQUEZ—"yes";

Amendment No. 10, offered by Representative GALLEGLY—"no";

Amendment No. 12, offered by Representative CHABOT—"no";

Amendment No. 16, offered by Representative CANADY—"no";

Amendment No. 18, offered by Representative DREIER—"no";

Amendment No. 19, offered by Representative CHRYSLER—"yes";

Amendment No. 22, offered by Representative POMBO—"no";

Amendment No. 24, offered by Representative GOODLATTE—"no";

Amendment No. 28, offered by Representative BURR—"no";

Bryant motion to recommit—"yes".

Final passage—"no".

In addition, on Thursday, I would have voted "no" on rollcall vote 80, "no" on rollcall vote 81, "yes" on rollcall vote 82, and "no" on rollcall vote 83.

And, on the motion to go to conference on the omnibus continuing appropriations bill, I would have voted "yes".

Finally, on Friday, I would have voted "no" on both the rule and final passage of H.R. 125, to repeal the assault weapon ban.

TRIBUTE TO GIRL SCOUT GOLD AWARD RECIPIENT

HON. DAVID R. OBEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 26, 1996

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, today, I would like to salute an outstanding young woman, Elizabeth Fox, who has been honored with the Girl Scouts of the U.S.A. Gold Award by the Indian Waters Girl Scout Council in Eau Claire, WI.

She is being honored for earning the highest achievement award in Girl Scouting. The Girl Scout Gold Award symbolizes outstanding accomplishments in the areas of leadership, community service, career planning, and personal development.

Girl Scouts of the U.S.A., an organization serving over 2.6 million girls, has awarded more than 20,000 Girl Scout Gold Awards to senior Girl Scouts since the inception of the program in 1980. To receive the award, a Girl Scout must fulfill five requirements: earn four interest project patches, earn the Career Exploration pin, earn the Senior Girl Scout Leadership Award project, earn the Senior Girl Scout Gold Award project. A plan for fulfilling the requirements of the award is created by the senior Girl Scout and is carried out through close cooperation between the girl and an adult Girl Scout volunteer.

For the Girl Scout Gold Award project, Elizabeth organized a stuffed animal drive in her community and donated the toys to local timeout shelters. For her project, Elizabeth assessed the needs of her community, developed a plan to address one specific area in need, and followed through with the project to completion. The organizational and communications skills she developed through the project will benefit her throughout her life, and Elizabeth's dedication to Eau Claire will benefit the community for a long time to come.

The earning of the Girl Scout Gold Award is a major accomplishment for Elizabeth Fox, and I believe she should receive the public recognition due her for this significant service to her community and her country.

HONORING CHARLES C. WILLIAMS

HON. DALE E. KILDEE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 26, 1996

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to rise before my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives to recognize Mr. Charles C. Williams. Mr. Williams is retiring after many years of dedicated public service. A retirement dinner in his honor is to be held on March 29, 1996 in Flushing, MI.

Throughout his 40-year career, Mr. Williams worked diligently to improve the lives of those who were less fortunate, and who were most in need. Mr. Williams proved to be a tireless advocate for children and played a vital role in helping to develop and advance programs dedicated to the preservation of one of the most important resources, the family. His work on behalf of his community has earned him the respect of not only his colleagues, but also the countless people whose lives were touched by him.

Mr. Speaker, Charles C. Williams has worked selflessly to make his community a better place in which to live. I know that his retirement dinner is not meant to celebrate his departure from the Department of Social Services, rather, the dinner is meant to show him the deep and abiding love and respect his colleagues, his family, his friends, and his community have for him. I ask you and my fellow Members of the 104th Congress to join me in paying tribute to such a dedicated public servant, Mr. Charles C. Williams.

H.R. 2202—THE IMMIGRATION IN THE NATIONAL INTEREST ACT

HON. PATRICK J. KENNEDY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 26, 1996

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. Mr. Speaker, I believe H.R. 2202 creates an aura of fear and suspicion within our communities. Instead of addressing the real problem—the loss of our jobs to illegal immigrants, it unfairly punishes children and college students seeking an education. My district in Rhode Island is comprised of American citizens and legal residents of a multitude of races and nationalities. Because of that, I voted against final passage of the bill.

I wholeheartedly support H.R. 2202's initiatives to end illegal immigration by increasing the number of border control agents, building additional roads and barriers and cracking down on employers who hire illegal aliens. This mean spirited bill however, heightens the fear, hysteria, and anti-immigrant fervor that is running rampant across this country. For this reason, I could not in good conscience support this legislation.

My district in Rhode Island is enriched by the many people who have brought their cultures and traditions to this great Nation to build a life for themselves and for future generations. I am proud of these hardworking Americans, who each day go to work, pay taxes, and contribute to creating a stronger United States and Rhode Island.

Rhode Island boasts a myriad of ethnic groups who take pride in these cultures and traditions. This allows future generations of Rhode Islanders to celebrate the lives of their forebearers while providing the greater community the opportunity to share, learn, and respect the value of difference. This fellowship is part of the solution to ending the ignorance and fear of the unknown. Whether it be the Portuguese fiestas in Bristol, the Greek festivals in Pawtucket, the Hispanic celebrations in Central Falls, the French-Canadian traditions in Woonsocket, the Italian feasts in North Providence, or the Irish parades in Newport, Rhode Islanders value and cherish their ethnic roots. H.R. 2202 contributes to the slow but sure demise of these cultural values.

I find it unconscionable that Congress would approve legislation allowing school administrators the right to demand proof of citizenship before allowing a child to receive an education. It is a travesty that in an effort to curb illegal immigration, the authors of this bill have chosen to scapegoat children. Have we become so desperate that we must resort to these drastic measures? Creating an Orwellian society in which individuals must present a